



Michigan
Transportation Asset
Management Council

Data Committee Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, January 23, 2019 @ 1:00 PM

Michigan Department of Transportation Aeronautics Building
1st Floor Auditorium
2700 Port Lansing Road
Lansing, Michigan

1. Welcome - Call to Order – Introductions
2. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items
3. Consent Agenda
 - 3.1 Approval of the 11-28-19 Data Committee Meeting Minutes (*Action – Attachment 1*)
 - 3.2 TAMC Budget Update (*Attachment 2*)
4. Presentations – TAMC Lead Analyst
 - 4.1. 2018 Preliminary Summary of PASER Data Analysis - *Chesbro*
5. Review & Discussion Items:
 - 5.1. 2017 Draft Reported Bridge Investments for TAMC Annual Report – *McEntee*
 - 5.2. 2017 Draft Reported Road Investments for TAMC Annual Report – *McEntee*
 - 5.3. Investment Reporting Compliance Review Update – *Belknap* (*Attachment 3*)
 - 5.4. Update on Paving Warranties and the TAMC IRT – *McEntee*
 - 5.5. Investment Reporting: Review Process of Future Projects & Three-year Plan Requirements – *Start/Belknap*
 - 5.6. Establishing a Traffic Signal Survey/Inventory Pilot & Subject Matter Experts – *McEntee/Belknap*
 - 5.7. Website/Dashboard/Investment Reporting Tool (IRT) Update – *CSS*
 - 5.7.1. Update on Ownership vs. Jurisdiction in Data Conversation
 - 5.7.2. Update on Creation of Dashboards for Top 123 Agencies Under Public Act 325
 - 5.7.3. Culvert Data Integration of Interactive Map/Dashboards/IRT
6. Public Comments
7. Member Comments
8. Adjournment

The next TAMC Data Committee Meeting is scheduled for February 20, 2019 at the MDOT Aeronautics Building, 2nd Floor Commission Room, 2700 Port Lansing Road, Lansing, Michigan

Meeting Telephone Conference Line: 1-877-336-1828 Access Code: 8553654#

Data Committee Members: Committee Chair: Bill McEntee, CRA – Vice Chair: Jon Start, MTPA
Bob Slattery, MML – Jennifer Tubbs, MTA – Rob Surber, MCSS

**TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
DATA COMMITTEE**
November 28, 2018 at 1:00 p.m.
MDOT Aeronautics Building, 1st Floor Auditorium
2700 Port Lansing Road
Lansing, Michigan
MINUTES

****Frequently Used Acronyms Attached**

Members Present:

Bill McEntee, CRA – Chair
Jonathan Start, MTPA/KATS
Jennifer Tubbs, MTA

Bob Slattery, MML
Rob Surber, DTMB/CSS

Support Staff Present:

Roger Belknap, MDOT
Cheryl Granger, DTMB/CSS
Ed Hug, SEMCOG, via Telephone
Andy Manty, CTT/MTU, via Telephone
Peter Torola, CTT/MTU, via Telephone

John Clark, DTMB/CSS, via Telephone
Mark Holmes, DTMB/CSS, via Telephone
Dave Jennett, MDOT
Gloria Strong, MDOT

Members Absent:

None

Public Present:

Aaron Verhelle, RCOC

1. Welcome – Call-to-Order – Introductions:

The meeting was called-to-order at 1:10 p.m. Everyone present was introduced and welcomed to the meeting.

2. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items:

None

3. Consent Agenda:

3.1. – Approval of September 26, 2018 Data Committee Meeting Minutes - *Action Item* (Attachment 1)

Motion: J. Start made a motion to approve the September 26, 2018 meeting minutes; B. Slattery seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

3.2. – TAMC Budget Update (Attachment 2)

An updated financial report (11/28/2018) was provided to the committee and briefly discussed. M. Holmes informed the committee that so far this year CSS has spent approximately \$18,000 for this fiscal year on TAMC activities.

4. Presentations – Center for Technology and Training/MTU – A. Manty and P. Torola:

4.1. - 2018 Michigan Local Agency Pavement Treatment Life Study (Attachment 3)

Peter Torola, PE, Research Engineer from MTU, Center for Technology and Training, did a review of the October 25, 2018 document, giving explanations on the data and their findings as shown in the report.

4.2. - Analysis of TAMC Investment Reporting Data for Network Level Modeling on the Locally Owned Road System in Michigan (Attachment 4)

Andy Manty, PE, Research Engineer, MTU, CTT, did a review of the October 25, 2018 document, giving explanations on the data and their findings as shown in the report. MTU will try to get the changes needed in Roadsoft completed, and the costs associated with this project added into their work plan for next year (FY 2020) that will help with the storage of this data.

5. Review and Discussion Items:

5.1. – Status of 2018 PASER Data Collection – R. Belknap (Attachment 5)

R. Belknap gave an update on the data collection efforts as of November 27, 2018. Data collection efforts are now completed. R. Belknap explained that with the changes in the IRT, statistics of the uploaded data is readily available and any problems can now be found quickly. So far, for federal aid roads 60 counties have been collected and uploaded into the IRT and 24 counties of non-federal aid data has been collected.

5.2. – Integration of Road Improvement Data into Annual PASER Survey – R. Belknap

J. Snell, Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, had addressed the TAMC Data Committee at their September 26, 2018 meeting to see if it is possible to do a final improvements survey towards the end of the data collection season that accounts for all road improvements and make things more efficient. He stated that jurisdictions are hesitant to do their evaluations in the spring. If they do them in the spring of an odd year it causes problems with their deterioration curves and their billing. There is work that goes on during the calendar year and it would be better to do a final improvement survey at the end of the data collection season. He requested that a feature be added to Roadsoft to insert the construction as it is done. This way they could do it in the office instead of sending a team back out. This information could then be added to the IRT. After further review and discussions with other regions and MTU, the committee decided to not make these changes at this time in Roadsoft. The regions did not seem to feel this was something necessary for 2019. SEMCOG did have a small concern due to how large their area of collection is. Data Committee may look at doing this in the future if there is a need and funds are available. This will require further discussion. Will this information make it into the statewide system? Will they be required to have a three-person team? Would they have to rate twice a year? A process will need to be made in the future if TAMC decides to do this. MTU and support staff feel that regions currently have the funds and ability to do some QA/QC.

Communities that have federal aid roads that do not get rated by the MPO three-person teams on a regular basis can go out and rate with just their own certified local team and download that data to the laptop and when the MPO goes out and does their ratings, they can add this information into their ratings and upload into the system.

5.3. – Schedule of Asset Management Plans (Public Act 325) – B. McEntee/R. Belknap (Attachment 6)

A listing of Michigan's Top 123 Road Agencies numbered by 1,2,3, from the alphabetized list, starting from the bottom, was provided in a November 20, 2018 letter from TAMC. The list showing which agencies will be in Groups 1 (TAMP due 10/1/20); Group 2 (TAMP due 10/1/21); and Group 3 (TAMP due 10/1/22) was shared. MTU is working on an updated asset management plan template that agencies can complete that provides all seven of the requirements. MTU will hold four classes in December and inform local agencies that all of the elements are not in the template. MTU has a task in the 2019 work plan to create a template that meets TAMCs requirements. The first due date for the asset management plans is 2020. Agencies actually have two years before the final asset plan is due. If they have their plan in, they have time to have it reviewed and changes made before the final plan has to be submitted. They have to show progress by 2025. This gives them a longer period to make any kind of corrections; less pressure before the hard enforcement deadline. Since the November 20, 2018, TAMC letter was sent out, only five people have signed up for the TAMP Workshops. No one has received much feedback from the local agencies regarding the letter.

Action Item: R. Belknap will ask MTU to give an update on the revised asset management plan template at the December 5, 2018, TAMC full Council meeting.

5.4. – Investment Reporting: Review Process of Future Projects and Three-year Plan Requirements – J. Start/R. Belknap

This is just a reminder and follow-up to the committee regarding the requirement for TAMC to review projects in the IRT and assure that they have made progress on the projects within the three-year deadlines. It was suggested to possibly ask a new question or modify a current question (possibly question #6 that is already in the IRT regarding asset management plans) to help answer the questions regarding project progress. B. McEntee would like to create a work team whose main focus would be how to meet this requirement and report out at the next Data Committee Meeting in January 2019. R. Surber and B. McEntee volunteered to be on this work team. The first task is to find out what planned projects agencies have already entered into the IRT.

Action Item: CSS will modify the question in the IRT to specifically ask agencies if they have entered future planned projects, do those projects relate to water asset managements, and do they have a three-year plan for the projects.

Action Item: The Work Team (that includes R. Surber and B. McEntee) will report out at the January 2019 Data Committee Meeting their findings on how the committee can meet the planned projects requirements.

5.5. – Website/Dashboard/Investment Reporting Tool Update – C. Granger/J. Clark

5.5.1. – Ownership vs. Jurisdiction in Data Conversation

CSS is currently working on the Crash and Safety dashboards. They have come upon a problem with agencies entering data by ownership and others entering data by jurisdiction (geographic region). Several of the data sets that CSS uses comes from MDOT. They combine this data with CSS current data. It is unclear if agencies are reporting the same data – by ownership or by geographic region. This creates a big disparity in the data. Even though it is more complex for CSS to enter in the information by geography, it is felt by the Data Committee that because this is a public site, the public would be more interested in the data by geographic region and not by ownership. CSS will contact MDOT to verify if the data they have submitted to CSS is by ownership or geographic region. They will work with MDOT and find out where the discrepancies are.

Action Item: CSS will contact the different areas within MDOT that supply them with the different data sets and verify if the data they have submitted to CSS is by ownership or geographic region. They will work with MDOT and find out where the discrepancies are. CSS will report back to the Data Committee at the next meeting.

5.5.2. – Creation of Dashboards for Top 123 Agencies Under Public Act 325

CSS will name the Top 123 Agencies as described under Public Act 325 as “Agencies with 100 Plus (+) Centerline Miles” in the dashboards per Data Committee.

5.5.3. – Culvert Data Integration of Interactive Map/Dashboards/IRT

CSS can add the collected data from the past Culvert Project and place that information in a dashboard. They estimate that it will take 100-150 hours of work. To add it to the interactive map it will take 80-100 hours of work. They have provided to R. Belknap an estimate on how much this will cost them to accomplish. Support staff will review the TAMC budget to see if this is within the budget. CSS does have contingency funds available in their work plan. CSS will check to see if they can do it out of their contingency funds or at least help cover the costs. MTU and CSS will work together to integrate this and other culvert data that was not submitted by agencies that had

previously done their culvert data collection prior to the culvert project pilot into the TAMC database if possible. CSS will have to look at each individual dashboard – Safety, Bridge, Crash, Traffic, etc. – and figure out where they can place the culvert data.

6. Public Comments:

None

7. Member Comments:

B. McEntee just wanted to make the Data Committee aware that TAMC will be asked to add the Warranties Program information to the TAMC Website and interactive map in the near future. There is an agreement between MDOT, the County Road Association, and possibly the Michigan Municipal League on the Warranty Program. There is a warranty check box currently in the IRT when agencies are entering a project. There are eight warranty items that need to be entered into the system and five or six of the eight items are already currently be collected in the IRT. In the interactive map they will need to show how many warranties projects there are across the state and where they are located. If a project is \$2,000,000, it is required that a warranty be provided. An agency can request a warranty for lower cost projects however, the warranty is not mandatory. If that information is provided, staff can enter those warranties into the website. LTAP will be handling the warranties. CSS will break down the warranties by counties. This will be in future discussions.

R. Belknap and J. Start stated that TAMC must make their FY 2020 budget request to the MIC by January 2019.

8. Adjournment:


Motion: B. McEntee made a motion to adjourn the meeting; B. Slattery seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present. The meeting adjourned at 3:23 p.m.. The next meeting will be held December 19, 2018, at 1:00 p.m., MDOT Aeronautics Building, 2nd Floor Commission Conference Room, 2700 Port Lansing Road, Lansing.

TAMC FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS:	
AASHTO	AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS
ACE	ADMINISTRATION, COMMUNICATION, AND EDUCATION (TAMC COMMITTEE)
ACT-51	PUBLIC ACT 51 OF 1951-DEFINITION: A CLASSIFICATION SYTEM DESIGNED TO DISTRIBUTE MICHIGAN'S ACT 51 FUNDS. A ROADWAY MUST BE CLASSIFIED ON THE ACT 51 LIST TO RECEIVE STATE MONEY.
ADARS	ACT 51 DISTRIBUTION AND REPORTING SYSTEM
BTP	BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING (MDOT)
CPM	CAPITAL PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE
CRA	COUNTY ROAD ASSOCIATION (OF MICHIGAN)
CSD	CONTRACT SERVICES DIVISION (MDOT)
CSS	CENTER FOR SHARED SOLUTIONS
DI	DISTRESS INDEX
ESC	EXTENDED SERVICE LIFE
FAST	FIXING AMERICA'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT
FHWA	FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
FOD	FINANCIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION (MDOT)
FY	FISCAL YEAR
GLS REGION V	GENESEE-LAPEER-SHIAWASSEE REGION V PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
GVMC	GRAND VALLEY METRO COUNCIL
HPMS	HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM
IBR	INVENTORY BASED RATING
IRI	INTERNATIONAL ROUGHNESS INDEX

IRT	INVESTMENT REPORTING TOOL
KATS	KALAMAZOO AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY
KCRC	KENT COUNTY ROAD COMMISSION
LDC	LAPTOP DATA COLLECTORS
LTAP	LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
MAC	MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES
MAP-21	MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21 ST CENTURY (ACT)
MAR	MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF REGIONS
MDOT	MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
MDTMB	MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TECHNOLOGY, MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
MIC	MICHIGAN INFRASTRUCTURE COUNCIL
MITA	MICHIGAN INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION
MML	MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
MPO	METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MTA	MICHIGAN TOWNSHIPS ASSOCIATION
MTF	MICHIGAN TRANSPORTATION FUNDS
MTPA	MICHIGAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ASSOCIATION
MTU	MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
NBI	NATIONAL BRIDGE INVENTORY
NBIS	NATIONAL BRIDGE INSPECTION STANDARDS
NFA	NON-FEDERAL AID
NFC	NATIONAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION
NHS	NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM
PASER	PAVEMENT SURFACE EVALUATION AND RATING
PNFA	PAVED NON-FEDERAL AID
PWA	PUBLIC WORKS ASSOCIATION
QA/QC	QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY CONTROL
RCKC	ROAD COMMISSION OF KALAMAZOO COUNTY
ROW	RIGHT-OF-WAY
RPA	REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RPO	REGIONAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SEMCOG	SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
STC	STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
STP	STATE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM
TAMC	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
TAMCSD	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL SUPPORT DIVISION
TAMP	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN
TPM	TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE MEASURES
UWP	UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM
WAMC	WATER ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

S:/GLORIASTRONG/TAMC FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS.11.2018.GMS

TAMC Budget Expenditure Report

<div>Michigan Transportation Asset Management Council</div>		FY17 Budget			FY17 Actual			FY18 Budget			FY18 Year to Date			FY19 Budget			FY19 Year to Date			
		(most recent invoice date)	\$	Spent	Balance				\$	Spent	Balance				\$	Spent	Balance			
I. Data Collection & Regional-Metro Planning Asset Management Program																				
Battle Creek Area Transportation Study	4 qtr 18	\$	20,000.00	\$	15,444.03	\$	4,555.97	\$	20,500.00	\$	20,213.36	\$	286.64	\$	20,500.00	\$	-	\$	20,500.00	
Bay County Area Transportation Study	4 qtr 18	\$	20,000.00	\$	10,794.42	\$	9,205.58	\$	21,100.00	\$	8,028.84	\$	13,071.16	\$	21,100.00	\$	-	\$	21,100.00	
Central Upper Peninsula Planning and Development	4 qtr 18	\$	40,471.00	\$	40,471.00	\$	-	\$	47,000.00	\$	47,000.00	\$	-	\$	47,000.00	\$	-	\$	47,000.00	
East Michigan Council of Governments	DEC	\$	95,995.00	\$	80,092.75	\$	15,902.25	\$	111,000.00	\$	81,559.65	\$	29,440.35	\$	111,000.00	\$	16,062.10	\$	94,937.90	
Eastern Upper Peninsula Regional Planning & Devel.	4 qtr 18	\$	20,000.00	\$	20,000.00	\$	-	\$	23,100.00	\$	23,100.00	\$	-	\$	23,100.00	\$	-	\$	23,100.00	
Genesee Lapeer Shiawassee Region V Planning Com.	OCT	\$	39,423.00	\$	37,172.06	\$	2,250.94	\$	46,000.00	\$	45,954.99	\$	45.01	\$	46,000.00	\$	-	\$	46,000.00	
Grand Valley Metropolitan Council	1 qtr 19	\$	20,000.00	\$	18,974.64	\$	1,025.36	\$	25,000.00	\$	12,060.69	\$	12,939.31	\$	25,000.00	\$	1,112.35	\$	23,887.65	
Kalamazoo Area Transportation Study	1 qtr 19	\$	20,000.00	\$	19,128.11	\$	871.89	\$	22,000.00	\$	21,588.77	\$	411.23	\$	22,000.00	\$	1,102.95	\$	20,897.05	
Macatawa Area Coordinating Council	4 qtr 18	\$	20,000.00	\$	7,405.66	\$	12,594.34	\$	20,200.00	\$	9,575.57	\$	10,624.43	\$	20,200.00	\$	190.00	\$	20,010.00	
Midland Area Transportation Study	4 qtr 18	\$	20,000.00	\$	17,660.54	\$	2,339.46	\$	21,000.00	\$	20,857.81	\$	142.19	\$	21,000.00	\$	-	\$	21,000.00	
Northeast Michigan Council of Governments	DEC	\$	43,426.45	\$	43,426.45	\$	-	\$	52,200.00	\$	52,200.00	\$	-	\$	46,000.00	\$	10,175.86	\$	35,824.14	
Networks Northwest	SEPT	\$	61,316.00	\$	61,316.00	\$	-	\$	72,000.00	\$	71,915.46	\$	84.54	\$	72,000.00	\$	-	\$	72,000.00	
Region 2 Planning Commission	3 qtr 18	\$	37,940.00	\$	24,743.56	\$	13,196.44	\$	42,000.00	\$	18,368.33	\$	23,631.67	\$	42,000.00	\$	-	\$	42,000.00	
Saginaw County Metropolitan Plannning Commission	4 qtr 18	\$	20,000.00	\$	11,585.29	\$	8,414.71	\$	22,200.00	\$	22,000.00	\$	200.00	\$	22,200.00	\$	-	\$	22,200.00	
Southcentral Michigan Planning Commission	1 qtr 19	\$	53,162.00	\$	36,915.67	\$	16,246.33	\$	57,300.00	\$	37,137.28	\$	20,162.72	\$	57,300.00	\$	1,913.04	\$	55,386.96	
Southeast Michigan Council of Governments	DEC	\$	135,680.00	\$	135,679.60	\$	0.40	\$	174,000.00	\$	174,000.00	\$	-	\$	174,000.00	\$	29,890.62	\$	144,109.38	
Southwest Michigan Planning Commission	4 qtr 18	\$	37,030.00	\$	37,030.00	\$	-	\$	41,000.00	\$	41,000.00	\$	-	\$	41,000.00	\$	-	\$	41,000.00	
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission	4 qtr 18	\$	33,786.00	\$	33,786.00	\$	-	\$	40,000.00	\$	21,680.54	\$	18,319.46	\$	40,000.00	\$	-	\$	40,000.00	
West Michigan Regional Planning Commission	SEPT	\$	82,467.00	\$	82,467.00	\$	-	\$	91,000.00	\$	74,351.07	\$	16,648.93	\$	91,000.00	\$	-	\$	91,000.00	
West Michigan Shoreline Regional Development Com.	OCT	\$	46,781.56	\$	46,145.01	\$	636.55	\$	54,000.00	\$	51,333.45	\$	2,666.55	\$	54,000.00	\$	301.28	\$	53,698.72	
Western Upper Peninsula Regional Planning & Devel.	4 qtr 18	\$	34,867.00	\$	34,847.53	\$	19.47	\$	40,000.00	\$	40,000.00	\$	-	\$	40,000.00	\$	-	\$	40,000.00	
MDOT Region Participation & PASER Quality Control	10/14/18	\$	62,750.00	\$	85,337.50	\$	(22,587.50)	\$	80,000.00	\$	52,914.97	\$	27,085.03	\$	91,440.00	\$	-	\$	91,440.00	
Fed. Aid Data Collection & RPO/MPO Program Total		\$	965,095.01	\$	900,422.82	\$	64,672.19	\$	1,116,400.00	\$	946,840.78	\$	169,559.22	\$	1,116,400.00	\$	60,748.20	\$	1,055,651.80	
II. PASER Data Collection (Paved, Non-Federal-Aid System)																				
PASER PNFA Data Collection Total		\$	40,760.39	\$	40,760.39	\$	-	(FY18 PNFA Moved Into Data Collection Program Above)						(FY19 PNFA Moved Into Data Collection Program Above)						
III. TAMC Central Data Agency (MCSS)																				
Project Management	12/31/18	\$	37,800.00	\$	40,064.00	\$	(2,264.00)	\$	42,000.00	\$	46,585.00	\$	(4,585.00)	\$	42,000.00	\$	15,141.00	\$	26,859.00	
Data Support /Hardware / Software	12/31/18	\$	60,200.00	\$	58,833.00	\$	1,367.00	\$	68,800.00	\$	67,800.00	\$	1,000.00	\$	68,800.00	\$	3,400.00	\$	65,400.00	
Application Development / Maintenance / Testing	12/31/18	\$	83,280.00	\$	78,238.00	\$	5,042.00	\$	114,475.00	\$	115,250.00	\$	(775.00)	\$	114,475.00	\$	300.00	\$	114,175.00	
Help Desk / Misc Support / Coordination	12/31/18	\$	66,600.00	\$	65,652.00	\$	\$948.00	\$	70,200.00	\$	68,200.00	\$	2,000.00	\$	70,200.00	\$	9,900.00	\$	60,300.00	
Training	12/31/18	\$	27,600.00	\$	29,133.00	\$	(1,533.00)	\$	34,950.00	\$	24,850.00	\$	10,100.00	\$	34,950.00	\$	350.00	\$	34,600.00	
Data Access / Reporting	12/31/18	\$	47,155.00	\$	45,696.00	\$	1,459.00	\$	49,575.00	\$	52,175.00	\$	(2,600.00)	\$	49,575.00	\$	18,775.00	\$	30,800.00	
FY17 Off Budget: IRT Re-write - \$241,000		9/30/17	\$	241,040.00	\$	260,023.00	\$	(18,983.00)												
TAMC Central Data Agency (MCSS) Total		\$	322,635.00	\$	317,616.00	\$	5,019.00	\$	380,000.00	\$	374,860.00	\$	5,140.00	\$	380,000.00	\$	47,866.00	\$	332,134.00	
IV. TAMC Training & Education (MTU) Calendar Year Z1																				
V. TAMC Activities (MTU) Z15/R1		1/18/19	\$	210,000.00	\$	208,658.90	\$	1,341.10	\$	235,000.00	\$	219,780.57	\$	15,219.43	\$	220,000.00	\$	-	\$	220,000.00
VI. TAMC Expenses		1/2/19	\$	70,000.00	\$	60,253.50	\$	9,746.50	\$	115,000.00	\$	114,089.32	\$	910.68	\$	120,000.00	\$	5,485.88	\$	114,514.12
Fall Conference Expenses	12/11/18	\$	6,000.00	\$	8,312.40			\$	10,000.00	\$	7,269.00			\$	10,000.00	\$	7,507.40			
Fall Conf. Attendance Fees + sponsorship Fees	12/11/18	\$	-	\$	2,625.00			\$	-	\$	4,405.00			\$	-	\$	6,755.00			
Net Fall Conference	12/11/18	\$	8,625.00	\$	8,312.40	\$	312.60	\$	14,405.00	\$	7,269.00	\$	7,136.00	\$	16,755.00	\$	7,507.40	\$	9,247.60	
Spring Conference Expenses	11/5/18	\$	8,000.00	\$	6,721.80	\$	-	\$	3,800.00	\$	7,439.36			\$	10,000.00	\$	-			
Spring Conf. Attendance Fees + sponsorship Fees	8/17/18	\$	-	\$	6,140.00			\$	-	\$	8,350.00			\$	-	\$	-			
Net Spring Conference	11/5/18	\$	14,140.00	\$	6,721.80	\$	7,418.20	\$	12,150.00	\$	7,439.36	\$	4,710.64	\$	10,000.00	\$	-	\$	10,000.00	
Other Council Expenses	12/19/18	\$	3,915.29	\$	8,483.24	\$	(4,567.95)	\$	10,000.00	\$	7,301.72	\$	2,698.28	\$	10,000.00	\$	935.22	\$	9,064.78	
TAMC Expenses Total		\$	26,680.29	\$	23,517.44	\$	3,162.85	\$	36,555.00	\$	22,010.08	\$	14,544.92	\$	36,755.00	\$	8,442.62	\$	28,312.38	
VII. Culvert Pilot Project																				
Central Data Agency (MCSS)	10/16/18	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	15,000.00	\$	9,312.00	\$	5,688.00							
MTU Project Management	1/2/19	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	172,100.00	\$	172,100.00	\$	-							
TAMC Administration & Contingency	11/7/18	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	84,438.00	\$	-	\$	84,438.00							
Central Upper Peninsula Planning and Development	3 qtr 18	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	88,641.00	\$	51,909.64	\$	36,731.36							
East Michigan Council of Governments	SEPT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	328,607.00	\$	259,229.13	\$	69,377.87							
Eastern Upper Peninsula Regional Planning & Devel.	4 qtr 18	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	5,688.00	\$	5,034.70	\$	653.30							
Genesee Lapeer Shiawassee Region V Planning Com.	SEPT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	124,909.00	\$	54,266.60	\$	70,642.40							
Grand Valley Metropolitan Council	4 qtr 18	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	77,782.00	\$	69,733.25	\$	8,048.75							
Kalamazoo Area Transportation Study	SEPT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	50,402.00	\$	15,879.65	\$	34,522.35							
Northeast Michigan Council of Governments	SEPT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	33,506.00	\$	21,781.96	\$	11,724.04							
Networks Northwest	SEPT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	184,513.00	\$	163,641.05	\$	20,871.95							
Region 2 Planning Commission	3 qtr 18	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	54,900.00	\$	2,328.00	\$	52,572.00							
Southcentral Michigan Planning Commission	SEPT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	93,456.00	\$	36,137.17	\$	57,318.83							
Southeast Michigan Council of Governments	SEPT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	87,644.00	\$	45,757.96	\$	41,886.04							
Southwest Michigan Planning Commission	4 qtr 18	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	101,849.00	\$	67,138.17	\$	34,710.83							
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission	4 qtr 18	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	47,587.00	\$	6,962.44	\$	40,624.56							
West Michigan Regional Planning Commission	SEPT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	241,511.00	\$	181,441.39	\$	60,069.61							
West Michigan Shoreline Regional Development Com.	SEPT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	144,238.00	\$	89,092.30	\$	55,145.70							
Western Upper Peninsula Regional Planning & Devel.	4 qtr 18	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	63,229.00	\$	46,960.41	\$	16,268.59							
Culvert Pilot Project Total		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	2,000,000.00	\$	1,298,705.82	\$	701,294.18							
Total Program		\$	1,635,170.69	\$	1,233,613.05	\$	83,941.64	\$	3,882,955.00	\$	2,976,286.57	\$	906,668.43	\$	1,873,155.00	\$	122,542.70	\$	1,750,612.30	
Appropriation		\$	1,626,400.00					\$	3,876,400.00			23.35%	\$	1,876,400.00					93.46%	

Note: Highlighted cells indicate final FY18 invoice still forthcoming

Summary Statistics – TAMC Investment Reporting Compliance

As of January 15, 2019

Fiscal Year 2016

Counties	
Agencies Approved for Investment Reporting	83
Cities/Villages	
Agencies Approved for Investment Reporting	526
Not Approved: #1 – No Data or IRT User	1
Not Approved: #2 – IRT & ADARS Not Matching	4
Not Approved: #3 – IRT Status Not Updated	1
Agency Not Yet Reported (Not Yet Due or Extension)	1
MDOT – Approved for Investment Reporting	1

Fiscal Year 2017

Counties	
Agencies Approved for Investment Reporting	83
Cities/Villages	
Agencies Approved for Investment Reporting	522
Not Approved: #1 – No Data or IRT User	2
Not Approved: #2 – IRT & ADARS Not Matching	2
Not Approved: #3 – IRT Status Not Updated	5
Agency Not Yet Reported (Not Yet Due or Extension)	1
MDOT – Approved for Investment Reporting (3-5-18)	1

Fiscal Year 2018

Counties	
Agencies Not Yet Due for Reporting	83
Cities/Villages	
Agencies Approved for Investment Reporting	324
Not Approved: #1 – No IRT User or Data	2
Not Approved: #2 – IRT & ADARS Not Matching	3

Not Approved: #3 – IRT Status Not Updated	86
Not Approved: #4 – Needs to complete survey	19
Agency Not Yet Reported (Not Yet Due)	99

MDOT – Not Yet Due for Reporting	1
----------------------------------	---

RAB 1-15-19